SOCIAL SCIENCES

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY MAY 4 1959

April, 1959

Volume Eighteen

Number Four

URBAN LAND

NEWS AND TRENDS . . .

IN CITY DEVELOPMENT

PUBLISHED BY URBAN LAND INSTITUTE

CHANGING PATTERNS OF URBAN GROWTH 1959-1975

By Homer Hoyt
Land Economist and Market Analyst
Washington, D. C.

Editor's Note

In this article on Changing Patterns of Urban Growth, Dr. Homer Hoyt presents his concept of what urban U.S.A. can be in 1975 if we have the foresight to grasp the opportunity. Certain elements of this pattern are already emerging. Dr. Hoyt feels that the economic basis for the self-contained community lies in the sewage treatment plant. We wonder if there is not an equally compelling reason which will make the self-contained community—long the dream of the planners—a practical economic reality—even a necessity; that is the increasing difficulty of moving the genus Homo around the landscape ten times a week from home to work. Our freeways won't do it unless we gear them to a rational pattern of land use.

The paper on which this article is based was originally presented at a Conference of the Department of Engineering, University of California. It will appear in the Summer, 1959 issue of *Business Horizons* published by the School of Business, Bureau of Business Research, Indiana University, at Bloomington, and appears here through the courtesy of that magazine.

If he were starting from scratch in a new continent the planner would have unlimited opportunity to create a new urban and agriculture pattern in which new homes, stores, industries, office buildings and government buildings could be placed in ideal relationship to each other, to the automobile highway and mass transport systems and to the rural areas. For a single city, such an opportunity presented itself to L'Enfant in the planning of Washington, D. C., and to the planners designing the new capitals of Australia and Brazil. Instead of a tabula rasa, the planners in the United States today are confronted with urban and rural patterns of settlement that are the result of the largely unregulated efforts of millions of individuals working over a period of several centuries.

The form of our cities has been shaped mainly by economic forces, or by what was conceived to be the "highest and best" use of the land at the period when the buildings were constructed. The buildings, however, have a physical life of 40 to 100 years or more and before the end of their physical life, new inventions, new modes of transportation and new habits of living often render them obsolete. We have a conglomeration of old and new urban patterns superimposed upon each other which gives rise sometimes to this type of wishful thinking:

"Would we not shatter it to bits—and then
Remould it nearer to the heart's desire"

OMAR KHAYYAM

or else plan for a future in which all existing structures will be worn out and a new ideal plan, ignoring all present buildings, brought into being. It is, of course, impossible to tear down the physical structure of our buildings and replace it with a new structure in the next ten or twenty years.

(*Continued on Page 3*)

If reproduced in whole or in part, credit must be given to URBAN LAND *and to the author.*

Plan-itorial . . .

Urban Renewal vs. Industry Exodus

The movement of industry from urban centers to outlying areas is a problem confronting virtually every major city in the U.S. Blight, congestion, shortage of suitable industrial land, obsolescence of existing industrial facilities, changes in production and materials handling techniques, shifting markets, changing transportation patterns, increased importance of aesthetic considerations—these are some of the factors contributing to the exodus of industry from central city areas.

This loss of badly needed ratables has prompted some cities to look to urban renewal as a means of counteracting this trend. Certainly there is much to be said for this approach as long as the plans for such industrial redevelopment projects are realistic and don't tilt at windmills. However, it would be folly for the central city to attempt to compete (through an industrial renewal project) with the periphery areas of the city for those industries requiring extensive acreages of land, only a portion of which is to be utilized initially; or those desiring a campus-like setting for their new plant. Because of the high cost of acquiring and clearing land in central city areas and the high valuation of such property, it is unlikely that it would be economically feasible, even with Federal subsidies, for the developer of an industrial district in an urban renewal area to enforce the land to building ratios and setback requirements frequently imposed in industrial parks in suburban areas where raw land is plentiful and relatively inexpensive.

Nevertheless, there are many industrial and semi-industrial firms, such as printing establishments, newspaper publishers, hotel supply firms, certain food processing and bottling plants, and many service industries which prefer, or even require, central locations and would be willing to pay premium prices for central city sites. It is toward the needs of these types of firms that industrial districts in central city areas should be designed.

A Case in Point

Last year the Cincinnati Planning Commission published its *Preliminary Plans for Redevelopment* setting forth recommendations for the redevelopment of the 400-acre Kenyon-Barr Urban Renewal Area, based on a detailed use and marketability study of the area by Dr. James B. Sheehan. The plan is an excellent example of practical application of the principles outlined above.

Noting the locational advantages of the property, the industrial section of the plan recommends that "maximum use be made of the land that will be available for private development, even to the extent of promoting the construction of multi-story structures, eliminating side yards, and deliberately selecting tenants who will offer the highest employment densities." For design purposes, a density of 80 employees per acre was established for the 190-acre light industrial area, yielding a total of 15,200 employees. Average building coverage would amount to one-third of the site area, with another third of the land reserved for parking. The remaining third would be devoted to setbacks, landscaping, pedestrian malls, and loading and unloading areas.

To achieve maximum space economy and still maintain an atmosphere of openness, the plan advocates the creation of eight large industrial "courts," ranging in size from 15 to 30 acres, together with several smaller ones. All would be served by a network of major expressways and local distributor streets. A typical industrial "court" would include the following basic features:

(a) A central parking compound, isolated from both the traffic and manufacturing noise and comprising about one-third of the land area of the "court." In addition to providing off-street parking for customers and workers, these compounds would be landscaped and contain pedestrian malls, lunch-time recreational and service facilities, and other amenities usually associated with high-class residential and commercial developments.

(b) Contiguous industrial buildings including some multi-story structures for use by smaller firms requiring a downtown location but with relatively modest space needs and limited rent budgets.

(c) Loading and unloading dock space either "within the buildings or in courtyards effectively screened from the passer-by."

(*Continued on Page 6*)

URBAN LAND

Vol. 18, No. 4 **April, 1959**

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF
URBAN LAND INSTITUTE
1200 18th St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
Single copies $1.00; 50¢ to U.L.I. Members.
MAX S. WEHRLY, Editor
J. ROSS MCKEEVER, Asst. Editor

OFFICERS OF
URBAN LAND INSTITUTE

DAVID D. BOHANNON, San Mateo, Calif., President
BOYD T. BARNARD, Philadelpha, Pa., First Vice President
CLARENCE M. TURLEY, St. Louis, Mo., Second Vice President
WAVERLY TAYLOR, Washington, D. C., Secretary
MAURICE G. READ, Berkeley, Calif. Treasurer
MAX S. WEHRLY, Executive Director

CHAIRMEN OF
URBAN LAND INSTITUTE COUNCILS

HUGH POTTER, Houston, Texas Community Builders' Council
BOYD T. BARNARD, Philadelphia, Pa. Central Business District Council
EARL D. HOLLINSHEAD, Pittsburgh, Pa. Industrial Council

TRI-COUNCIL MEETING

The first joint meeting of the three Councils and Sustaining membership of ULI will be held in Columbus, Ohio, on June 11, 12, 13, 1959. Theme of the sessions will be the Dynamics of Urban Growth.

Member John W. Galbreath has offered his famous 2,000-acre Darby Dan Farm outside Columbus as the site for the sessions.

Miles Colean, ULI Trustee and well-known consulting economist, will deliver the keynote address and will summarize the thinking of the conference. George W. Mitchell, Vice President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, will address the meeting on the Financial and Fiscal Implications of Urban Growth.

Other sessions will include case study analyses of central city and suburban growth, and a field inspection of the Columbus area.

Attendance is limited to Sustaining members of ULI. Regular members desiring to attend should make inquiry to the Washington office.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF URBAN GROWTH

(*Continued from Page 1*)

National Wealth and Buildings

Of the estimated total national wealth of one-and-a-third trillion dollars in 1955, $688 billion, or half, was represented by structures. Our total new construction for 1955 was $33.8 billion or 5 percent of the total building value. We have in the United States a total of approximately 55 million dwelling units valued at $353 billion, and our new building has been at an average annual rate of 1,100,000 units a year for the past ten years, or 2 percent of the total number in existence. The building industry is not now equipped to supply the labor and materials; the financial institutions are not prepared to furnish the mortgage funds and the home buyers are not prepared to purchase at present day costs, the required number of houses a vastly enlarged program of home building would require.

Office buildings, stores and factories, as well as apartments, are built in response to economic demand and cannot be constructed without the presence of a sufficient number of tenants capable of paying an economic rent.

Thus, the opportunity for planning is in the new growth that is expected in the United States in the next ten to twenty years, and in the gradual replacement of worn-out areas.

Growth of Population

Thirty years ago, on the basis of birth and death rates at the time, it was predicted that the population of the continental United States would increase to 155 million and thereafter it would remain static or decline. As a result of the rapidly rising birth rate before and after World War II, the population of the United States in August 1958 was 175 million, and is now expected by the U. S. Bureau of the Census to increase to 225 million by 1975,[1] a gain of 50,000,000 persons or approximately 14,000,000 households. To house this number of households may well require from 10,000,000 to 14,000,000 acres of land, including schools, churches, recreation areas and other related uses.

In the next 17 years there will be a demand for at least 14,000,000 homes as a result of the formation of new households. By 1975, the remainder of the 20,264,000 dwelling units built before 1920, which were in existence in 1950, will be 55 years or more old. In 1950, 4,339,000 dwelling units were reported as dilapidated and 5,133,000 had no running water. Certainly at least 10,000,000 if not more, of our dwellings should be replaced by 1975.

[1] Middle estimate

Housing Demand

The total demand for new residential dwelling units would thus be at least 24,000,000 for the next 17 years, an annual rate of 1,400,000 units a year. By the year 2000, when the population of the United States is expected to reach 330 million, there would be a demand for 50,000,000 added units above the present number.

What proportion of this total demand for housing will be self-financing—that is, what proportion of houses will be bought by families whose income will enable them to meet mortgage payments, taxes and upkeep on new homes? In 1956, there were 1,402,587 public housing units, or approximately 2.5 percent of the total number of dwelling units. Increasing rates of real earnings in the United States will enable a larger proportion of families to own their own homes, unless construction costs rise faster than real earnings.

Dr. Joseph L. Fisher of Resources for the Future estimates that the spendable income per capita in terms of 1957 dollars will increase from $2,540 in 1957 to $3,520 in 1975, a gain of 40 percent in real buying power. This would be equivalent to a family income of $12,250 in 1975. A family with an income of $12,250 a year could afford to pay $30,625 for a house. An average family with an income of $9,000 a year could then afford to buy a house costing $22,500, or two-and-a-half times annual income after Federal taxes.

Shopping Centers

In the period 1948 to 1958, fifty new regional shopping centers with over 35,000,000 square feet of store area, 120 community centers with over 26,000,000 square feet of store area, and several thousand smaller centers were built in the United States.

The 10,000,000 new families moving into suburban areas from 1960 to 1975, with an average annual family income of $9,000 a year, or an aggregate income of $90 billion, will be spending $60 billion in retail stores. To handle this volume at an average of $100 sales per square foot of gross store area would require 600,000,000 square feet of building area. Allowing a 4 to 1 ratio between parking and mall areas and gross building area would mean that 2,400,000,000 square feet would be needed for these purposes, or a total of 3,000,000,000 square feet or 69,000 acres.

This shopping center total could be divided into 60 new regional centers of 1,000,000 square feet building area each; 200 large community centers averaging 200,000 square feet each; 500 small community centers averaging 100,000 square feet each; and 9,000 local neighborhood centers averaging 50,000 square feet each as shown below:

Of course it is impossible to predict the exact proportions between the different types of centers, or how much of the increased volume can be attracted to shopping centers, but this indicates the magnitude of the problem.

Factory Buildings

The number of manufacturing employees in the United States, according to one estimate, will increase from 16,756,000 in 1955 to 25,732,000 in 1975, a gain of approximately 9,000,000 added workers. Allowing an average of 300 square feet per worker would mean that a total of 2.7 billion square feet of new factory building space would be needed, practically all in one-story buildings. Allowing a 1 to 1 ratio between parking and factory area would mean that an additional 2.7 billion square feet would be needed for parking areas, or a total of 5.4 billion square feet, or 124,000 acres. However, most large plants in suburban areas are acquiring a much larger amount of land in relation to floor space, so this figure should be considered a minimum.

		Average Building Area (Square Feet)	Total Building Area (Square Feet)
60	Regional Centers	1,000,000	60,000,000
200	Large Community Centers	200,000	40,000,000
500	Small Community Centers	100,000	50,000,000
9,000	Local Neighborhood Centers	50,000	450,000,000
Total 9,760			600,000,000

Office Buildings

New office building construction bears no exact relationship to population, varying from 1.5 square feet per capita for the Los Angeles metropolitan area to 5 square feet per capita for the Chicago metropolitan area; 10 square feet for the New York metropolitan area and 26 square feet for Midland, Texas, a city of 56,000 population, which is the office center of the oil industry of Western Texas.

If the added population from 1958 to 1975 requires only 3 square feet per capita, a total of 141,000,000 square feet of new office building space would be needed, or 1,410 office buildings of 100,000 square feet each. If the office buildings average 10 stories in height they would cover a ground area of 14,100,000 square feet.

New office buildings should have offstreet parking facilities available to them. On the basis of 500 square feet of parking space for each 1,000 square feet of office space, 70,000,000 square feet would be needed, making a total of 84,000,000 square feet or 1,930 acres for 10-story buildings if all parking is to be at ground level. Since the trend is to one and two-story buildings for such office uses as doctors, dentists and other professional groups, the average height of buildings would probably be nearer five than ten. With parking requirements remaining the same, this would generate a total area requirement of 98,000,000 square feet or 2,250 acres.

Demand for New Structures by Regions and Cities

We have discussed so far only the aggregate demand for new structures in the United States for a period 1958 to 1975. Buildings can be placed only in one fixed location and usually it is uneconomic to move a structure. Consequently, it is of paramount importance to analyze the economic base of each community to determine which areas have prospects of growth in basic industries, such as manufacturing for export, the tourist business, trade with a wide area outside the city, and so on.

The Pacific Coast and Mountain areas are expected to grow at a faster rate than the balance of the nation because of the strength of their basic economic activities. The Stanford Research Institute estimates that the population of the Mountain States will increase from 5,762,000 in 1954 to 9,582,000 in 1975, a gain of 66 percent, and the Pacific States from 16,733,000 to 29,439,000, a gain of 75.9 percent, while the balance of the United States is expected to increase its population from 141,393,000 to 182,733,000, or 29 percent in the same period.

Location Within Given Metropolitan Region

Having determined which metropolitan region will support new buildings, the next procedure is to select the most appropriate sites within the metropolitan region for the new growth.

The universal trend toward the suburbs makes more land available for all types of structures such as ranch-type houses, schools, churches, bowling alleys, one-story factory buildings and new type shopping centers, all of which now require extensive areas for parking. Even large office buildings such as the Prudential Insurance Building in Minneapolis and the Connecticut General Life Insurance Building in Hartford, Connecticut are now locating in outlying areas.

However, the increasing spread of suburbs to points requiring an hour's travel time between home and place of employment has caused an increase of apartment building in central areas in the past year or two. Management headquarters and companies related to finance, stock exchange and central markets desire to be located within walking distance of one another, in buildings where vertical elevator transportation is quicker than horizontal transportation.

The new metropolitan communities should achieve a balance between the central city and the suburbs.

Economics of Urban Redevelopment

Economic redevelopment of central areas which does not add to the taxpayer's burden is feasible when the demand for the new uses is sufficient, not only to cover mortgage charges, operating expenses on the new buildings and real estate taxes, but to leave a sufficient residual net income for the land to justify the acquisition. The deficit between the acquisition cost and re-use value cannot be too great or the gap cannot be made up by Federal and local grants.

While there is a gain in plottage value due to the creation of new uses more profitable than the old, it must be remembered that acquisition costs must cover the cost of buying existing structures still yielding an economic return which will be wrecked, thus greatly increasing the cost of the site. Also, the costs of new utilities, grading, and related items must be added.

Consequently, for a central redevelopment area, intensive uses such as elevator office buildings, semi-luxury apartments, stores, garages, hotels and the like must be developed. For each of these uses there must be an economic demand at rates more than sufficient to cover interest, depreciation and operating costs on new buildings.

In estimating the new demand, the supply of existing structures must be considered, and care must be exercised not to erect structures which will create excessive vacancies and lower the value of downtown properties. Such uses as single family homes, one-story factories and low or medium rent apartments are not ordinarily economically feasible for central areas containing structures still yielding an economic return.

Downtown redevelopment for areas such as Bunker Hill in Los Angeles, offer the golden opportunity planners seek. This area of 136 acres can be cleared of all structures and rebuilt, on a low land coverage, with an ideal grouping of office buildings, apartments, hotels and shops, with garages adjacent to the buildings being served, in one integrated area and with complete separation of pedestrian and automobile traffic.

There is a sound and legitimate reason for central city redevelopment. Stores here offer the greatest variety and depth of merchandise; it is the central meeting place for the entire metropolitan area; the chief recreation and amusement center; the location of the courts and records; the focal point of all transportation media; and the headquarters center of an entire economic region, and in a few cities, of the entire continent. Here space is at a premium, but planning new office centers like Rockefeller Plaza in New York shows the value of allowing open spaces even at the central core.

Industries, offices, stores and amusement places which require these central advantages can pay a sufficient rent to yield an economic return on urban redevelopment.

It is a mistake to locate low income families or low paying uses, which do not need to be at the center, in these pivotal central sites.

Development of New Suburbs

Ten million houses have been built in the suburbs in the ten years 1948 to 1958. While many better types of communities have been built with winding streets, culs-de-sac and wider

building lots, which are to be preferred over the rigid gridiron plan and the narrow lots of most pre-World War II housing developments, still suburban development has largely been the result of piecemeal building by separate land owners. Few complete suburban communities have been developed.

Suburban residential expasion has often proceeded as a solid mass extension from the older city. First, detached settlements were flung out, dependent upon the use of individual septic tanks. Then, as the community extended central sewer and water utilities, the areas between the settlements filled in solidly with houses, leaving little or no space for recreation areas because the land served by utilities became too valuable to give any away.

The building of 24,000,000 new homes in the period 1958 to 1975, of which possibly 20,000,000 will be on the edges of existing communities, will afford the opportunity to plan thousands of new communities. If only half of this total, or 10,000,000 homes were constructed in communities with an average of 2,500 households, 4,000 new model planned communities could be created in the next 17 years.

New Communities

The essential economic basis for these communities is the sewage disposal plant. It is not economically feasible to extend central sewer systems over great distances of open country as it is possible to extend water lines. Consequently, separate communities can be established, surrounded by greenbelts over a wide area on the periphery of central metropolitan areas on the basis of sewage disposal plants for each community, which are economically feasible and safe from a health standpoint.

These communities would consist of a number of different types. Some would contain industries and shopping centers, as well as homes and recreation areas, and be almost complete and self-sufficing. Others might contain only homes for one homogeneous income group, where the residents would work in the offices and factories of the nearby city. Nearly all, however, would have a balance between single family residences and apartments, which would enable young families without children, or retired couples, to live within the community. All the communities would have ample open recreation areas, not only within the built-up areas themselves but in the surrounding open areas.

Shopping

The new regional shopping center of the mall type, with underground service tunnels, on 50 to 100 acres of land, is a triumph of architectural planning. Constructed on land in suburban areas acquired at relatively low cost, they are economically successful when a combination of department stores, apparel stores and other fashion stores attract such a volume of sales that central downtown land values have been recreated on prairie sites. However, the high cost of the structures for two or three level department stores with escalators, the service tunnels, parking areas, air-conditioning in all stores, de luxe store fronts, etc., sometimes set up such a burden of fixed charges that a high volume of sales is necessary to reach the break-even point. Thousands of smaller shopping centers of the strip type have been built at far less cost but are also more vulnerable to competition from the larger centers offering a more complete selection of merchandise. This new type of center—either of the mall or strip type—can be built in open country near the new residential areas that will develop beyond the dense body of urban settlement.

Vacation Areas

The airplane has tremendously extended the area available for weekend and short holiday vacation trips. The piston engine plane made it possible for thousands of persons in the northern United States to take weekend vacations in Florida, Arizona and California, and on short holidays to fly to the Caribbean Islands, Mexico and Hawaii in the winter and to Western and Northern United States and Canada in the summer. The jet planes will extend the range of vacation travel much farther and enable one to go, even on a short vacation, to the islands in the Pacific, to South America and to Europe. The economy rates on the new jet airliners have placed foreign travel within the reach of most family budgets. Thus, areas devoted to recreation in the United States will, in the future be competing to a greater extent with recreation areas in all parts of the world. However, the continuing shortening of the working week and increased leisure time will create an increasing demand for recreation areas within the United States.

Industry

Factory owners now universally prefer one-story plants where all manufacturing operations can be conducted on one floor level, where trucks and railroad cars can deliver materials inside the plant, where the factory can be expanded on any side and where there is ample yard space for storage and for parking. Since adequate land space is now of paramount importance, and since all the workers now own automobiles and most shipments are by truck, industrial managers now prefer suburban locations on belt highways, with railroad connections nearby.

The new type of industry in attractive landscaped grounds can be placed near high-grade residential suburbs, so that managers and foremen can live near their work. Attractive surroundings for industry are now important assets in attracting highly skilled personnel.

New Office Buildings

Office buildings for companies which are self-sufficient, such as insurance companies, can be located in park-like settings like the Prudential Insurance Company in Minneapolis and the Connecticut General in Hartford. Here there is ample parking space for the cars of employees and customers, together with restaurants, cafeterias and recreation for their convenience.

Future Land Planning

Thus in the wide open areas around our old cities, a new form of urban-rural pattern is emerging. The residential communities with swimming pools, large recreation areas, and with the advantages of their own schools and community facilities will be separated by green belts from other communities, but connected to industries a few minutes away by belt highways. Large regional shopping centers on belt routes or expressways will bring the shopping variety of the central city to their doors. Office buildings of insurance and other self-sufficient companies will provide employment in nearby open areas. Thus families will live, work, shop and play in large open suburban areas, far removed from the congestion and clamor of the old city.

The Central City

Meanwhile, the center of the city itself—the old core—will be reconstructed with tall office buildings, apartments and garages, on a low building coverage surrounded by parks, with a complete separation of automobile and pedestrian traffic. The reconstructed central area will be the management, cultural, amusement and

major shopping centers of the far-flung metropolis. Here will live many couples without children, single persons and retired families, who prefer apartments near central places of employment, shopping and amusement.

Conservation Areas

After the slums near the center are first cleared away, in time the present dense middle-aged conservation areas, or areas where most of the structures have 10 to 20 years of remaining economic life, between the central core and the suburbs will also be razed and replaced by new garden apartments in super blocks. Barring a World War III, the dawn of the 21st Century should usher in a new urban America, rebuilt according to the planning principles now emerging.

The entire land area used by urban and rural non-farm structures is only 25 million acres, or 1.3 percent of the land area of the United States. Even with the most lavish use of open land, the area absorbed for urban purposes will probably not exceed 50 million acres, or 2.6 percent of the land area in this country. The automobile and the express highways have opened up great areas of land within quick commuting of central places of employment, so that the old urban pattern, restricted to a narrow compass within a few miles of the central railway depots or steamship docks by slow streetcar transportation, can be discarded.

Financing the New Urban Pattern

Most of the new types of structures we have described will pay their own way. The families will have sufficient income to buy most of the new homes and pay an economic rental on apartments; consumers of retail goods will pay for new shopping centers, and manufacturers will have sufficient earnings to pay for new factory buildings.

The high level of national income—$430 billion in 1975, in 1947 dollars, or $473 billion in 1957 dollars, should provide a sufficient margin for public expenditures for highways, public buildings and urban redevelopment as well as for defense. The total expenditures for national defense were $43 billion in 1958. In 1955 all governments, mostly State, spent $6.5 billion on highways. From 1945 to 1956 the United States made foreign grants and credits in the amount of $58 billion. The Federal Government debt has now reached the staggering total of $276 billion (May 1958).

Many of us would reason that we could rebuild the United States on an ideal pattern in a few decades with the amount spent for defense and foreign aid. While that is demonstrably true, if we could avoid defense expenditures, the fact is that we would face destruction as a nation if we neglect defense to rebuild our cities.

The question then is—can we pile heavy subsidies for rebuilding on top of defense expenditures? If a complete subsidy is required it would cost a minimum of $20,000 per family to provide a new house, all utilities, new schools, churches, streets, etc., for each family to be subsidized. That would amount to a subsidy of $20 billion for each 1,000,000 families and $200 billion for the 10,000,000 families who would comprise the lowest income one-fifth in our population.

It is not economically feasible to increase our debt limit from $276 billion to $476 billion without bringing on certain inflation which would further reduce the value of the present 50-cent dollar to a quarter, wipe out half the value of savings and insurance policies, and render social security payments totally inadequate to support retired persons. This does not mean, however, that all funds for urban renewal or public housing should be curtailed.

Expenditures of $10 to $15 billion for urban redevelopment that can be repaid out of increased tax revenues over a ten-year period, limited subsidies for properly designed public housing for well deserving tenants, highway expenditures which will increase the efficiency of our highway system for civilian and military uses, and the like can be supported by our ever expanding economy. We have demonstrated that we can sustain a tax burden of $75 billion a year for Federal taxes alone that would formerly have been regarded as stifling all progress and initiative, without lessening our productive efforts. Some reduction of Federal expenditures or some increase in our real national income will provide a margin for the most needed urban redevelopment, slum clearance and highway expenditures.

PLAN-ITORIAL

(*Continued from Page 2*)

Some Questions

In view of contemporary concepts of industrial district standards for recent trends in production methods, industrial building requirements and patterns of occupancy, some of the above recommendations raise a number of questions. For instance—Will the district and the surrounding area adequately handle the additional automobile and truck traffic that the proposed high density, multi-story development will generate? Can the handling, loading and unloading of material be carried on in multi-level buildings by different industries without undue confusion and congestion? Is there *actually* a good market for multi-story industrial space? (At present there are millions of square feet of vacant multi-story industrial space in major cities throughout the country.) Will the policy of encouraging an "incubator" type industrial tenancy with a high turnover rate tend to increase the danger of district deterioration?

No doubt these and similar aspects of the proposal were analyzed and resolved prior to the approval of the preliminary plans, but they serve to illustrate the types of problem that should receive critical attention before the financing and physical construction of such a project is begun.

The significance of this plan lies not so much in the technical details of layout as in the fact that it recognizes the economic and physical characteristics and limitations of a central city industrial location and does not attempt to imitate the low density of the suburban "ranch-type" industrial park. This is borne out by the following quotation:

"The fact that land is less costly in outlying districts, and central locational advantages are not important there, is partly responsible for the differences in the way land is utilized in out-lying versus close-in areas. The industries interested in the Kenyon-Barr locations are not looking for cheap land in the sense that price is the paramount consideration in finding a location. [Kenyon-Barr land is expected to bring an average of $2.00 per square foot.] They need a particular location—the downtown area, essentially. They also recognize that they cannot have a 'country club' setting in the locations that best suit them."

All too often, in striving to create the "city beautiful," planners are apt to lose sight of the significance of cost factors. Such is not the case here.

While certain aspects of the Kenyon-Barr plans give pause for thought, the study is to be commended for its realistic and forthright approach to two major social and economic problems of urban areas—blight and lack of adequate and desirable industrial sites within the city.

ROBERT E. BOLEY
Secretary, Industrial Council